processor operable to implement all such input program commands or sequences of input program commands as required to generate the procedural textures of the standardized set.

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-4, 7 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Karmen et al. Claims 5-6 and 8 stand rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Karmen et al. in view of Griffin et al. Claim 11 stands rejected under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Karmen et al. in view of Tremblay et al. Based on the following, these rejections are respectfully traversed.

In order to clarify the presently claimed invention, claim 1 has been amended to recite "an input to receive via a network identifying data identifying one of the set of standardized textures". Support for this amendment can be found on page 7, -second paragraph. Further, claim 1 has been amended to clarify that "the identifying data comprises one or a sequence of program commands, the execution of which will result in the generation of a respective procedural texture".

In addressing the presently recited "identifying data comprises one or a sequence of program commands, the execution of which will result in the generation of a

respective procedural texture" in the above rejection, it is stated that in column 2, lines 31-39, Kamen also discloses that the texture can also be derived by the means of procedural texturing.

However, in column 2, lines 32-39, Kamen discloses:

"In some computer graphics systems, the texture values themselves are not contained in a pre-stored table...but rather are calculated or derived from a mathematical function which is used to model the associated texture values."

Based on the above disclosure, it is evident that the mathematical function used to model the associated texture values of Kamen is not received via a network. Therefore, the presently recited "identifying data" is distinguishable over Kamen.

The above-described deficiencies of Kamen et al. are also not addressed by either Griffin et al. or Tremblay et al. since these references are being relied on for other features. Thus, the invention of claims 1-11 is not obvious over Kamen et al. alone or, in combination with either Griffin et al. or Tremblay et al. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the above rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn so that the present application may proceed to issue.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to credit any overpayment or charge any fee (except the issue fee) to Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By Russell Gross
Russell Gross, Reg. 40,007
Attorney
(914) 333-9631
March 2, 2001

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

It is hereby certified that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first-class mail in an envelope addressed to:

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

On March 2, 2001

By Edna Chapp

A P P E N D I X

1. (Twice Amended) Apparatus for texture mapping in a computer graphics system, using a predetermined set of standardized textures, the apparatus having an input to receive via a network ~~data~~ identifying data identifying one of the set of standardized textures, and means for processing the data to generate output texels of the identified texture, wherein each texture of the standardized set is a procedural texture, the ~~input~~ identifying data comprises one or a sequence of program commands, the execution of which will result in the generation of a respective procedural texture, with the means for processing data comprising a processor operable to implement all such input program commands or sequences of input program commands as required to generate the procedural textures of the standardized set.